



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/628,496 07/28/00 BRESNAN

M F-192

EXAMINER

TM02/0302

PAUL A LEVITSKY
PITNEY BOWES INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & TECHNOLOGY LAW D
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE P O BOX 3000
SHELTON CT 06484

COSIMANO, E
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2161
DATE MAILED:

03/02/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/628,496

Applicant(s)

BRESNAN ET AL

Examiner

Edward R. Cosimano

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2000 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2161

1. Applicant should note the changes to patent practice and procedure effective December 01, 1997 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 62, No. 197, Friday October 10, 1997.

2. In regard to the instant reissue application, the following has been noted:

A) an reissue declaration signed by the inventors Bresnan and Oh, which asserts an error has been received.

B) the consent of the assignee of US Patent no. 5,873,073 which is sought to be reissued by the instant reissue application, has been received.

C) the reissue declaration complies with 37 CFR § 1.175(a)(1) and 37 CFR § 1.175(a)(2).

D) **AN OFFER TO SURRENDER THE ORIGINAL U.S. PATENT 5,873,073 AS REQUIRED BY 37 CFR § 1.178 HAS NOT BEEN RECEIVED.** It is noted that the reissue declaration, which has been signed by the inventors Bresnan and Oh, offers to surrender the original patent, US Patent no. 5,873,073. However, the records of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office indicate that inventors Bresnan and Oh do not own the original patent, because on December 24, 1996 they had assigned the application which would mature into the original patent, US Patent no. 5,873,073, to Pitney Bowes Inc. Therefore, the owner of the original patent, US Patent no. 5,873,073, has not offered to surrender the original patent as required, and hence, an proper offer to surrender the original patent has not been received.

E) the instant reissue application, which seeks to broaden the claimed invention, contains a new declaration executed by inventors Bresnan and Oh.

F) the instant reissue application, which seeks to broaden the claimed invention has been filed within two years of the issue date of US Patent no. 5,873,073.

G) new claims 20-47 as submitted do not conform to the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.121(b)(2)(ii), since the amendment was not accompanied by the required statements in support of the amended subject matter.

H) the prior art cited in the original patent, US Patent no. 5,873,073, has been cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 28, 2000, and considered by the examiner.

I) in regard to the recapturing of claimed subject matter lost during the prosecution of the original patent, the original disclosure does not permit the use of a single printer to print both the contents and mailing information on the envelope. Therefore, the printers mentioned in the claims added by the instant reissue application must include the use of two separate printers. Hence, the deletion of the references to the first and second printers in the claims sought to be added by the instant reissue application is not an attempt to recapture claimed subject matter.

3. Claims 43 as submitted does not conform to the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.173 and 37 CFR § 1.121(b)(2)(i)(C), since it is a new claim that has not been completely underlined as required by 37 CFR § 1.121(b)(6).

4. The drawings are objected to because:

A) the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, therefore, the subject matter of:

(1) claims 23, 27 & 42, in regard to determining the postage from the entered characteristics, if supported by the original disclosure;

(2) claim 28, in regard to transmitting the address list and document data separately from the first node/processor to the terminal/second node/processor, if supported by the original disclosure; and

(3) claims 34 & 44, in regard to verifying the address list at the terminal/second node/processor, if supported by the original disclosure; must be shown in the drawings as required by 37 CFR § 1.83(a) or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s) (note: no new matter should be entered).

Correction is required.

4.1 Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in response to this Office action (37 CFR § 1.121(a)(3)(ii)). However, correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A) applicant must update:

(1) the application data on page 1,

with the current status of each of the referenced applications, e.g., --now abandoned--, or --now patent #?--, or --which is abandoned and now serial number #?--, etc.

B) the following errors have been noted with in the disclosure:

- (1) at claim 1, line 6, applicant's use of a ";" is confusing.
- (2) at claim 1, line 16, applicant's use of a ";" is confusing.
- (3) at claim 1, line 19, applicant's use of a ";" is confusing.
- (4) at claim 3, line 5, applicant's use of a ";" is confusing.
- (5) at claim 18, line 3, applicant's use of a ";" is confusing.

C) the following disclosed subject matter is confusing:

(1) at page 8, lines 22-34, "The method ... memory.", in regard to fig. 5D, step 380 is reached when the user has selected not to continue at step 376, and that the user is NOT DONE at step 378. The disclosed function of step 380 is "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." (page 8, lines 32-34). Applicant's own disclosure of the function(s) associated with step 380, clearly indicates that all of the entered data, without a restriction to a particular time or action/step is not retained in the memory of the system. Hence at step 380 all of the entered data from the time that the user started to define the mailing is lost. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354.

(2) see also page 9, lines 7-9, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 406. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382.

(3) see also page 10, lines 46-48, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 459. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408.

(4) see also page 11, lines 4-6, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system

Art Unit: 2161

memory." in regard to step 493. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408 or 461 or 465.

(5) see also page 11, lines 43-45, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 519. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408 or 461 or 465 or 491 or 497.

(6) see also page 12, lines 19-21, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 545. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408 or 461 or 465 or 491 or 497 or 517 or 523.

(7) see also page 12, lines 55-57, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 571. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408 or 461 or 465 or 491 or 497 or 517 or 523 or 543 or 549.

(8) see also page 13, lines 45-47, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 609. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408 or 461 or 465 or 491 or 497 or 517 or 523 or 543 or 549 or 575 or 579.

(9) see also page 14, lines 13-15, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 633. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408 or 461 or 465 or 491 or 497 or 517 or 523 or 543 or 549 or 575 or 579 or 607 or 613.

(10) see also page 14, lines 62-64, "... the user presses "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 659. This action would include erasing the data

Art Unit: 2161

saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408 or 461 or 465 or 491 or 497 or 517 or 523 or 543 or 549 or 575 or 579 or 631 or 637.

(11) see also page 15, lines 42-44, "... the user selects "CANCEL" and any entries made in defining the mailing are not retained with in the system memory." in regard to step 685. This action would include erasing the data saved at steps 350 or 354 or 382 or 408 or 461 or 465 or 491 or 497 or 517 or 523 or 543 or 549 or 575 or 579 or 657 or 663.

However, it would seem more logical if the operation of steps 380, 406, 459, 493, 519, 545, 571, 609, 635, 659 & 685 erased only the data entered from the last point of saving data while the rest of the entered data should be retained, because at each of these points in the system's operation, the user has entered a large amount of configuration/setup data which would be lost by the disclosed erasure. With this modification the user would not have to waste time by reentering the same data. That is by saving the data instead of erasing the data, then the saved configuration/setup data could be recalled and either modified it or supplemented at a latter time for use by the user at a latter time.

D) the subject matter of:

(1) claims 23, 27 & 42, in regard to determining the postage from the entered characteristics, if supported by the original disclosure;

(2) claim 28, in regard to transmitting the address list and document data separately from the first node/processor to the terminal/second node/processor, if supported by the original disclosure; and

(3) claims 34 & 44, in regard to verifying the address list at the terminal/second node/processor, if supported by the original disclosure;

lacks antecedent basis within the specification as required by 37 CFR § 1.75(d1).

Appropriate correction is required.

6. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings.

Art Unit: 2161

Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)) & § 1.121(a)(1)-1.121(a)(6).

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7.1 The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as:

A) failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention.

B) the specification, as originally filed, does not provide support for the invention as now claimed.

7.1.1 The disclosure of US Patent no. 5,873,073 nor the instant disclosure as originally filed in regard to:

A) claims 23, 27 & 42, does not describe the ability of the instant postage processing and metering system to determine the required postage for an item of mail from the entered characteristics of the mail item. Hence, applicant has failed to provide and adequate written description of the invention and the determination of the required postage for an item of mail from the entered characteristics of the mail item is new matter.

B) claim 28, does not describe the ability of the instant postage processing and metering system to transmitting the address list and document data separately from the first node/processor to the terminal/second node/processor. Hence, applicant has failed to provide and adequate written description of the invention and transmitting the address list and document data separately from the first node/processor to the terminal/second node/processor is new matter.

C) claims 34 & 44, does not describe the ability of the instant postage processing and metering system to verify the address list at the terminal/second node/processor although the verification/cleaning of mailing list is disclosed. Hence,

Art Unit: 2161

applicant has failed to provide and adequate written description of the invention and the verifying of the address list at the terminal/second node/processor is new matter.

7.1.2 Claims 23, 27, 28, 34, 42 & 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

8. Claims 20, 23, 24, 27-39 & 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8.1 Claims 20, 24, 28-39 & 44-47 are inoperative and therefore lack utility for the recited purpose of the disclosed and claimed invention, since:

A) the recited purpose of the invention is to produce a finished mail piece, that is an item of mail that has been properly franked, see at least

- (1) the abstract;
- (2) the summary of the invention at page 2; and
- (3) page 4, lines 7-17.

However, claims 20, 24, 28-39 & 44-47, fail to recited that the item of mail is franked and hence it is not a finished mail piece as the instant invention is intended to produce. Hence, claims 20, 24, 28-39 & 44-47, fail to accomplish the desired result of the invention as set forth in the disclosure.

For as the Court has specifically pointed out, claims must recite utility for the disclosed purpose of the invention, (General Electric Co. v. U.S., 198 U.S.P.Q. 65 (U.S. Court of Claims, 1978), Hanson v. Alpine Valley Ski Area 204 U.S.P.Q. 794 (District Court, E. D. Michigan, N. Div. 1978) and Banning v. Southwestern Bell Telephone C., 182 U.S.P.Q. 683 (SD Tex, 1974)).

8.2 The subject matter of:

A) claims 23, 27 & 42, in regard to determining the postage from the entered characteristics, if supported by the original disclosure;

B) claim 28, in regard to transmitting the address list and document data separately from the first node/processor to the terminal/second node/processor, if supported by the original disclosure; and

Art Unit: 2161

C) claims 34 & 44, in regard to verifying the address list at the terminal/second node/processor, if supported by the original disclosure;
lacks antecedent basis within the specification as required by 37 CFR § 1.75(d1).

8.3 The scope and meaning of claim 43 can not be properly determined, since claims 43 as submitted does not conform to the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.173 and 37 CFR § 1.121(b)(2)(i)(C), because it is a new claim that has not been completely underlined as required by 37 CFR § 1.121(b)(6).

8.4 For the above reason(s), applicant has failed to particularly point out what is regarded as the invention.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(c) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

9.1 Claims 1-4, 6-12, 15-36 & 38-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Cordery et al (5,628,249 or Harmon et al (5,684,706) or Baker et al (5,067,305) or Murcko et al (5,476,255) in view of Humes et al (5,377,120) and common practice.

9.1.1 In regard to claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15-22, 24-26, 29-36, 38-41 & 43-46 either Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706) disclose a computer mail processing system that creates mailing. Any one of these systems at a first

computer/node creates the electronic data that describes the characteristics of one or more mail pieces, color, shape, size, postage class, include a reply envelope, etc. This electronic data includes document data for each mail piece and the associated mailing list/data. The document data and mailing list are then merged into a single electronic data file, that is then sent/transmitted to a second processor/node.

9.1.2 At the second processor/node, the electronic data is parsed into envelope/postage data and document data, which is then sent to a mail production machine. The envelope data is used by a first printer to print address data and postage indicia on an envelope. While, the document data is used by a second printer to generate the document. The item mail is completed when the printed document is stuffed/inserted into the associated preprinted envelope and the envelope is sealed.

9.1.3 Neither Baker et al ('305) nor Murcko et al ('255) nor Cordery et al ('249) nor Harmon et al ('706) disclose that the second processor/nod is necessarily separate and not under the control of the first processor/node. However, Humes et al ('120) in the environment of mail processing the following, the merging of documents to be mailed in accordance with a mailing list from a number of different merchants by an independent party. The independent third party then produces the merged mailing by printing the combined document data and mailing lists to create an item of mail and places the item of mail into the postal system. It is noted that the documents and mailing lists are merged so as to remove incorrect and/or duplicate mailing address so as to provide an overall lower mailing cost to each of the merchants. Since the system of Humes et al ('120) provides the benefit of lower mailing costs to a mailer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that the mail processing systems of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706) could be modified to use separately located mail production facility which removed incorrect and duplicate mailing address as taught by Humes et al ('120).

9.1.4 Further in regard to claims 1, 21, 22, 25, 26, 40 & 41, it is noted that neither Baker et al ('305) nor Murcko et al ('255) nor Cordery et al ('249) nor Harmon et al ('706) actually depict a postage meter. However, each of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706) disclose that after the completed mail piece has been

Art Unit: 2161

generated, the mail piece is franked and placed in the postal system for delivery. Since, the function of franking an item of mail commonly requires a postage meter or it's equivalent function/system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that the mail processing systems of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706) include a postage meter to produce a finished mail piece.

9.1.5 In regard to claims 8-10, since the systems of either of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706) as modified by Humes et al ('120) and interpreted in view of common practice, transmit the mailing data/file from one node to the next with out restricting the communications path/link, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that the mail processing systems of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706)) as modified by Humes et al ('120) and interpreted in view of common practice could include any number of nodes absent applicant's indication of unexpected results from a particular number of nodes.

9.1.6 In regard to claims 23, 27 & 43, since the systems of either of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706) as modified by Humes et al ('120) and interpreted in view of common practice, require the determination of the appropriate amount of postage for an item of mail and the size, shape, weight affect the require postage, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that the mail processing systems of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706)) as modified by Humes et al ('120) and interpreted in view of common practice would consider the characteristics of the item of mail when determining the require postage.

9.1.7 In regard to claim 28, since the systems of either of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or Harmon et al ('706) as modified by Humes et al ('120) and interpreted in view of common practice, transmit the mailing data/file from one node to the next with out restricting exactly or how the print file is formed and transmitted, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that the mail processing systems of Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) or Cordery et al ('249) or

Art Unit: 2161

Harmon et al ('706)) as modified by Humes et al ('120) and interpreted in view of common practice could generate the print filed as a combined file of the mailing list file and document file or a file of individual complete items of mail absent applicant's indication of unexpected results from a particular method of transmitting the print file.

9.2 Claims 5, 37 & 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Cordery et al (5,628,249 or Harmon et al (5,684,706) or Baker et al (5,067,305) or Murcko et al (5,476,255) as modified by Humes et al (5,377,120) and in view of common practice as applied to claims 1, 20 & 38, and further in view of common business practice.

9.2.1 In regard to the receipt of claims 5, 37 & 47, the systems of either Cordery et al ('249 or Harmon et al ('706) or Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) as modified by Humes et al ('120) and in view of common practice require the mailing data to be sent and processed by a third party. Further, it is common business practice by a service provider to be required to provide a receipt as proof that a service has been provided before the service provider is paid for that service. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that the operator of any one of the systems of either Cordery et al ('249 or Harmon et al ('706) or Baker et al ('305) or Murcko et al ('255) as modified by Humes et al ('120) and in view of common practice, would require the third party to provide a receipt as is common business practice.

9.3 Claims 13 & 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harmon et al (5,684,706) as modified by Humes et al (5,377,120) and in view of common practice as applied to claims 1, 11 & 12.

9.3.1 In regard to claims 13 & 14, Harmon et al ('706) further discloses that a second central computer system checks to see if the supplies required to generate the mail piece(s) are available at anyone of a number of mail piece generating stations. And schedules the task of generating the mail piece at the appropriate mail piece generating station.

10. The examiner has cited prior art of interest, for example:

A) Gilham (5,200,903) discloses the printing of a franking impression and destination address on an item of mail.

Art Unit: 2161

B) Sansone (5,329,102) discloses a mail processing system in which a single controller associates a mailing list with the contents of a document which is then generate and form into an item of mail.

C) Kara (5,801,944) discloses printing address and postage data on labels and a separate document which the user inserts into an envelope and applies the labels.

D) Yui (JP 09-270073) discloses the calculation of postage based on the characteristics of an item of mail and the printing of address and postage data on a label which may be applied to the item of mail.

E) Blechman, discloses that the Mail Master program will merge mailing lists with documents into a print file which can be printed to produce a mailing.

F) the Online Reporter article, discloses that the mailing lists and documents are merged into an electronic file which is then transmitted to an second location for the purposes of printing.


G) the PR Newswire article discloses the centralized cleaning of mailing list to reduce undeliverable mail.

11. The shorten statutory period of response is set to expire 3 (three) months from the mailing date of this Office action..

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (703) 305-9783. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached on (703)-305-9768. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

12.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL FAXES or for OFFICIAL FAXES for this group is either (703) 308-9051 or (703) 308-9052.

01/30/01


Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner A.U. 2161